	Applicat	ion No.	Applicant(s)	
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/092,1	48	MUDGE ET AL.	
	Examine	er .	Art Unit	
	Kevin L I	McHenry_	1725	
All Participants: Status of Application: <u>Allowed</u>				
(1) <u>Kevin L McHenry, examiner</u> .	(3)_	·		
(2) Gary Bush, applicant's representative.	(4) _			
Date of Interview: <u>2 December 2003</u>	Time:	<u>3:15 pm</u>		
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes If Yes, provide a brief description:]Applicant's repre No	sentative)		
Part I.	•			
Rejection(s) discussed:				
Claims discussed: 14				
Prior art documents discussed: none				
Part II.				
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING TH See Continuation Sheet	E GENERAL NATU	JRE OF WHAT V	/AS DISCUSSED:	
Part III.				:
 ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a second directly resulted in the allowance of the applicant of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a second did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief 	ation. The examine eparate record of t	r will provide a w he substance of	ritten summary of the subs the interview, since the into	stance
			• •	
			•	
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicant/Applicant	's Representative	Signature – if appropriate)

Application No. 10/092,148

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner indicated that the application was allowable except that language in claim 14 was confusing since claim 14 cited that the liner engages ends of the liner. Agreement was reached to amend claim 14 so that the language read that the body of the sleeve engages liner ends..